

The University of Akron IdeaExchange@UAkron

Honors Research Projects

The Dr. Gary B. and Pamela S. Williams Honors
College

Spring 2016

The Met Follows the World While Maintaining Peel's Heritage

Garrett J. J. Scherba

The University of Akron, gjs33@zips.uakron.edu

Please take a moment to share how this work helps you [through this survey](#). Your feedback will be important as we plan further development of our repository.

Follow this and additional works at: http://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/honors_research_projects



Part of the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Scherba, Garrett J. J., "The Met Follows the World While Maintaining Peel's Heritage" (2016). *Honors Research Projects*. 272.

http://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/honors_research_projects/272

This Honors Research Project is brought to you for free and open access by The Dr. Gary B. and Pamela S. Williams Honors College at IdeaExchange@UAkron, the institutional repository of The University of Akron in Akron, Ohio, USA. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Research Projects by an authorized administrator of IdeaExchange@UAkron. For more information, please contact mjon@uakron.edu, uapress@uakron.edu.

The Met Follows the World While Maintaining Peel's Heritage

Garrett J. J. Scherba

The University of Akron

Spring 2016

Abstract

The London Metropolitan Police Department patrol officers do not regularly carry firearms in their routine duties. The members of the public and police each have opinions regarding this topic. The department's history since its founding in 1829 developed strategies to engage with the public through community policing. This allows the agency to take a proactive approach to policing and implement intelligence-led policing into its daily patrol strategy. Intelligence-led policing promotes a unique relationship between the public and the police. This relationship is crucial to gaining the public confidence in the police, which allows them to not need to carry firearms in fulfilling their routine duties.

Keywords: London metropolitan police department, firearms, community policing, intelligence-led policing

I. INTRODUCTION

The London Metropolitan Police Department (Met) is a world famous police agency. Historically known around the globe for not using firearms, the Met intelligently performs its routine duties in order to accomplish its goals without regularly using firearms. The Met still uses a lot of the same methods of policing that Sir Robert Peel adopted when he first established the agency. The Met continues to engage with the public in a high level of service. While using a proactive policing approach in order to prevent crime and major situations from occurring. The complexity of the Metropolitan Police must be understood in order to determine the specific reasons the Met does not need to carry firearms in their daily patrol units.

This paper will detail the background of the Met in order to know the reasons the officers do not regularly carry firearms. It will outline the extent to which the department uses firearms in carrying out its duties. It must be noted that the Met does use firearms, just not by the regular patrol officers. Additionally, the Met will be compared to its counterparts such as the New York City Police Department in the United States. In doing so, the duties of the Met will be specified and also contrasted against those of its equivalent agencies.

Next, the two strategies of policing that the Met uses will be discussed. These include both service and force (James, 2014, p. 76). The Met implements a medium of both labels into fulfilling its duties. This allows them to be proactive in preventing crime, serving the public, and using intelligence-led policing. These two categories transform into determining the level of confidence the public has in the Met. This historic police agency uses public service to develop public support in the police department (Stanko et

al., 2012, p. 217). This drives collaboration between the police officers and the members of the public. This team-like effort allows the Met to rely on information that comes from the public. Consequently, intelligence-led policing is a direct result.

The appropriate balance of service and force as well as intelligence-led policing creates the atmosphere for community policing (James, 2014, p. 75). This style of law enforcement adheres to the goal that the police are established to serve the public (James, 2014, p. 76). In addition, the police agency works with the public to help serve them. Both are accomplished through direct interactions with the public. The direct interactions significantly increase the public confidence in the police (Stanko et al., 2012, p. 323).

However, the public confidence in the Met will only increase if the direct encounters with the public are effective (Stanko et al., 2012, p. 324). It is noted that not everyone has police contact (Stanko et al., 2012, p. 324). Therefore, the Met implements a strategy to engage with the members of the public that do not interact with the police. This unique method is the sending of letterbox mailers to people in the community that indirectly engages the police with the public (Stanko et al., 2012, p. 324).

When discussing methods to increase public confidence in the police, behavior that decreases public confidence is equally as important. When the police mistreat citizens, the public does not have as much confidence in the agency (Pizio, 2014, p. 250). Therefore, this paper will describe the disrespect officers receive from the public and the methods in which the police will respond. The level of disrespect correlates to the method in which the police respond and treat the public.

The Met does not regularly carry firearms due to its historical foundation when Sir Robert Peel created it. Instead it uses various tactics such as community policing and

intelligence-led policing. Recent events of police officers being shot and killed have called for the officers to regularly carry firearms. However, this paper will present the evidence that depicts both the police officers' views as well as the members' of the public views on the issue.

When determining if the Met should continue to implement more firearms into its daily duties, the statistics from Ireland, Scotland, and Wales should be used. These numbers give a broad understanding of crime and violence in the United Kingdom at large. Since Scotland, Ireland, and Wales are a part of the United Kingdom, they can provide valuable information to the firearm debate.

A study conducted by Best and Quigley in 2003 will be examined in order to analyze the police shootings that occurred between 1998 and 2001 (Best & Quigley, 2003, p. 350). These shootings are imperative in determining how much intervention the police do while on the scene before an armed response vehicle is requested and/or a shooting incident transpires. This data will assist in reviewing the reasons the Met does not carry firearms on a regular basis.

Lastly, this paper will evaluate the future movements of the implementing firearms within the Met. In this section, both the view's of the public and those of the police will be compared and contrasted to elicit an interpretation of the firearm policy moving forward. Since Scotland is a part of the United Kingdom and has enacted some policies on firearms, it will be used as an example of the British police department using firearms in order to reference the Met on this issue.

II. BACKGROUND OF THE LONDON METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT

The London Metropolitan Police Department is a magnificent law enforcement

agency that changed policing around the world. Home Secretary Sir Robert Peel founded the Met in 1829 (Mayer et al., 2008). It is often referred to as Scotland Yard and has become the “world’s most famous brand name in policing” as well as the most respected (Mayer et al., 2008). Its history and policing principals have guided its mission for centuries without alteration. Consequently, the Met became the model for many municipal police forces around the globe (Mayer et al., 2008). The detectives within the Met are the “global go-to-guys” for any police force that needs assistance with a politically charged investigation (Mayer et al., 2008). They have participated in the investigation of Benazir Bhutto’s assassination, sensitive operations like kidnappings, and forensics such as the Asian tsunami’s aftermath (Mayer et al., 2008). Many police forces base their policing model and structure off of the Met as well as seek assistance and guidance in their police operations and investigations.

The signature feature of the Met is that its police officers do not routinely carry firearms. This is in direct contrast of many forces throughout the world. The “unarmed bobby” is an iconic image in Britain similar to Big Ben or the Beatles (Keating, 2011). However, officers in Northern Ireland are an exception since they have been carrying firearms on a regular basis for years (Keating, 2011). Nevertheless, the majority of police officers in Britain, including Scotland Yard, still do not carry firearms. Instead they must use nonlethal weapons such as pepper spray and batons (Keating, 2011). Kelly (2014) states that since Sir Robert Peel developed the Met in 1829, its unarmed status developed its central identity throughout the world.

The Met is a considerable size, and arguably “one of the largest police services in the world” (Stanko et al., 2012, p. 217). It has approximately 31,500 police officers,

about 14,000 administrators, and over 4,000 police community service officers. Together it serves a population of 7.5 million people (Mayer et al., 2008). This is a large police department and the population it serves is large as well. The nearest equivalent to the Met is the New York City Police Department (NYPD). It has about 38,000 officers and serves a population of 8.2 million people. Despite the fact that these numbers are fairly close in size, it should be noted that the Met must cover about twice the geographic area than the NYPD (Mayer et al., 2008). Additionally, the Met is responsible for other functions and duties that the NYPD does not do. The Met is a combination of the NYPD, FBI, and United States Secret Service (Mayer et al., 2008). Similar to the FBI and NYPD, the Met is responsible for counterterrorism efforts. Although terrorism gets most of the Met's attention due to recent terrorist attacks, it is also responsible for the daily duties of police work. These police duties are primarily handled by the 32 borough forces (Mayer et al., 2008). Therefore, with both the added ground the Met must cover and added responsibilities, it may be argued to be smaller than the NYPD despite having more officers.

The Met has had significant accomplishments in its history that has transformed police work around the world. First, it pioneered DNA evidence and fingerprint technology (Mayer et al., 2008). Second, it has significant experience in combating terrorism (Mayer et al., 2008). This antiterrorism effort extends back to the historical campaigns executed by the Irish Republican Army. Lastly, in more recent times the Met has liaison officers that are stationed in sixteen different countries (Mayer et al., 2008).

III. STRATEGIES OF POLICING

Different types of policing may be categorized using labels. These labels are used

by many police agencies including the Met. According to James (2014), two ideological spectrums divide the argument over the “true purpose of policing” (p. 76). These two different categories are service and force (James, 2014, p.76). Each type of policing has different purposes and goals which determine the strategy or combination of the two strategies it uses. The advocates of the force approach generally desire the traditional view of policing which defines its true purpose and goal as crime-fighting (James, 2014, p. 76). In contrast, the supporters of the service style of policing contends that police work typically involves a broad range of services that respond to behavior that includes illegal acts (James, 2014, p. 76). These advocates also want someone, normally the police, to do something about this activity. Therefore, the service method does not view most police work as involving crime or law enforcement activity (James, 2014, p. 76). It is important to understand these viewpoints in order to acknowledge the reasons the Met does not need to carry firearms on a daily basis.

A combination of these two strategies are used by the Met. The Met’s history includes its own perspective on it incorporating these two spectrums into its services. The police force shifts its policing strategy between service and force depending on the ideals and philosophies of the department’s commanders (James, 2014, p. 76). The issue in determining the strategy the Met will use in order to carry out its police work and mission ultimately impacts its decision to carry firearms. Furthermore, the public and the police officers may influence these decisions based on the climate of each group. The history of the Met and the strategy it uses affects the policies of its officers carrying firearms in performing its daily duties.

IV. COMMUNITY POLICING

The appropriate balance of service and force produces concept of community policing. The London Met uses community policing as its main approach to police work. According to Pizio (2014), it is common to see foot patrol officers, often called constables, in London (p. 249). Furthermore, the Met also has community support officers to help fulfill its duties (Pizio, 2014, p. 249). The primary system of policing in the United Kingdom is neighborhood policing (Pizio, 2014, p. 249). According to Bullock (2013), the services police provide are oriented around familiarity, accessibility, and visibility (p. 126). The police officers in London use proactive crime control by walking or driving around the city responding to law enforcement related calls including citizen disputes. The unarmed police officers that are on regular patrol engage with the public and communicate with its members every day despite the fact that only a small amount of the officers' time is spent in crime-fighting activity (Pizio, 2014, p. 249). The Met uses community policing as a priority while also using its crime control function when necessary (Pizio, 2014, p. 249-250). The organizational mandate for the Met fosters a "police-citizen relationship" which is heavily based on encounters that are typically civil in nature and shared moral values (Pizio, 2014, p. 250). This primary focus of the Met is citizen-focused and couples the cultural norms of Britain. Further, it allows the police officers to be easily accessible and more approachable to the public (Pizio, 2014, p. 249-250). Community policing promotes the relationship between the community and the police (Bullock, 2013, p. 125). This policing approach allows the Met to have its patrol officers generally unarmed on a daily basis because the officers are more approachable with the public. The approachability of the officers creates the unique relationship the Met has with the public. This unique relationship allows the Met not to rely on firearms

during the execution of its daily activities. Consequently, the Met does not need to carry firearms on a daily basis.

Community policing creates an opportunity for intelligence-led policing (ILP). This is a crucial strategy that the Met uses which allows them to be the world leader in law enforcement. James (2014) states, “ILP is as old as the UK police service itself” (p. 75). ILP is engrained in the heritage of the Met including its foundation. Today, ILP has spread across the world and has been adopted by many police agencies in different nations (James, 2014, p. 75). Therefore, it may be concluded that the technique proves to be successful and efficient. Using local intelligence from the public helps to ensure that criminals are properly apprehended (James, 2014, p. 75). Furthermore, ILP assists the police in preventing incidents from occurring because they can use the actionable intelligence to intervene in a potential situation before a crime occurs. Community policing that uses ILP in order to have a proactive approach to law enforcement rather than a reactive approach enables the police force to not rely on firearms in its daily duties. The Met uses community policing and ILP which allows its regular patrol officers to not need to carry firearms during the execution of its daily responsibilities.

V. PUBLIC CONFIDENCE

Public confidence in policing in London is extremely important to the Met. The public perception and support is required for cooperation in ILP. The idea of community policing as well as the two strategies of policing, service and force, public confidence is, thereby, developed. Stanko et al. (2012), say a key goal for the Met is improving its public confidence (p. 217). Identifying the public’s concerns and responding to them is a necessity in community policing in order to improve the public’s confidence in the police

(Bullock, 2013, p. 127). However, it must be noted that the majority of the public does not come into contact with the police. According to the 2009-2012 British Crime Survey, 71 percent of the sample did not come into contact with police officers in the past twelve months (Stanko, 2012, p. 324). The 71 percent may be skewed to specific communities since some communities have more crime than others. Public confidence may be altered by police actions during interactions between the citizen's or members of the public and police officers (Stanko et al., 2012, p. 323). There are three primary drivers that are used to measure the public's confidence in the police force. Stanko et al. (2012), states these drivers are, "Public engagement, fair treatment and police effectiveness in dealing with crime" (p. 323). Nevertheless, the most effective route of improving public confidence is via police officer's direct encounters with the public (Stanko et al., 2012, p. 323).

Since the best method for officers to improve public confidence in the police is through direct interactions, they must ensure their actions are helping to improve this image. The demeanor in which officers treat the public is important in increasing the public image (Stanko, 2012, p. 324). Contrastingly, negative encounters with the police by members of the public will decrease the public confidence. If a large amount of the public feels upset, alienated, disappointed or angry after encounters with officers, then the police's public trust will diminish (Stanko, 2012, p. 324). Notwithstanding, indirect police contact will also have a large effect on the public perception. For example, when someone has a negative experience with the police, this negative perception may transfer to another person simply by talking about a particular negative encounter (Stanko et al., 2012, p. 324).

In addition to raising or lowering its public confidence by direct encounters, the

Met also uses other methods as well. First, the police tries to manage their relationship with the press. Second, it sends letterbox leaflets to connect with a wider population of the public that do not regularly engage with the police (Stanko et al., 2012, p. 324). A relationship with the media and press allows the police to connect with the public without having police contact. The Met's Safer Neighbourhoods Teams are responsible for disseminating these letterbox leaflets. The newsletters are distributed quarterly to all households in all of London's 624 wards. The contents of the newsletters are important to improving the police's public image despite the fact that the sole act itself will help the appearance of the Met by demonstrating that it cares about the public (Stanko et al., 2012, p. 324).

These letters will demonstrate to the public that the police cares about by including different information to effectively demonstrate they are genuinely concerned about the public. First, the newsletters will show that the Met knows and understands the local issues and that they "take these local concerns seriously" by addressing the issues. Second, that they are transparent in their police activities as well as report to the public the outcome of their actions. Third, that they "act on behalf and in the interest of the local community," also, by responding to the local issues. Lastly, they indicate to the members of the public that they do hold themselves accountable. The Met is able to accomplish this by reporting to the public via the quarterly newsletters (Stanko et al., 2012, p. 324-325).

Stanko et al. (2012) conducted a quasi-randomized study in London in order to determine the effectiveness of the newsletters, that the Met sends, to raise public confidence in the police. To achieve this they distributed a newsletter to all households in

four wards. These letters communicated the community engagement that was described above. The random population that was representative of the respondents in the four wards were interviewed before and after the newsletter was distributed. Additionally, three control groups were used in order to measure any impact that events, occurring simultaneously with this study, had on the public confidence in police (Stanko et al., 2012, p. 325).

This experiment had several conclusions. First, the newsletters had a “buffering effect” to oppose any negative impact of current events that allow the police to seem unsuccessful in responding to crime. Second, the newsletters did have “a positive impact on perceptions of police community engagement” (Stanko et al., 2012, p. 325). Lastly, the letters did not have an influence on the public’s perceptions of the manner in which the police treat the members of the public in direct police encounters. Therefore, it may be concluded that, overall, these newsletters only had a “small positive impact” in increasing the public’s confidence in the Met (Stanko et al., 2012, p. 325).

Communication with the public is a tool that the police may use. However, according to Stanko et al., (2012), “Not all communication with the public is good communication” (p. 325). There are many reasons that will make a piece of communication ineffective. For example, a newsletter that does not reflect the public’s concerns or makes the police seem incompetent in responding to the issues will be unproductive in communicating with the public. Further, a newsletter that makes the police department seem oblivious to the problems of the public may also be damaging. Consequently, poor communications may have a negative effect and actually decrease the trust the public has in the police. It may be concluded that a simple newsletter is not a

cheap alternative to engaging with the public (Stanko et al., 2012, p. 325). Therefore, the police must demonstrate, through their direct encounters with the public, that they understand the issues and are effective in dealing with crime. This will help build proactive relationships between the public and police in order to foster ILP and community policing. Increasing the public confidence in the police will allow the public to feel safe when the police do not carry firearms on a regular basis.

VI. CIVILIAN DISRESPECT

The issue of disrespect the officers receive from members of the public will affect the public's confidence and the methods in which the police respond to certain incidents. The majority of police encounters do not have unfavorable behaviors from both the members of the public and the police officers. Typically, these situations are completed cordially. However, it is recognized that the police will be required to interact with disrespectful citizens (Pizio, 2014, p. 251). These types of encounters will transform the methods in which the police deal with the predicament. Many officers acknowledge the fact that experiencing disrespect is possible. Unfortunately, it is not clear how officers define disrespect among the citizens (Pizio, 2014, p. 251). Furthermore, they anticipate it before entering into situations (Pizio, 2014, p. 253). They also expect that they will have to handle more disrespect when working with intoxicated citizens or when people threaten the officers or other members of the public. Domestic disputes, disorderly calls, drug offenses, pursuits, and serious crime calls all increase the officers' expectancy of disrespect. When police goes into situations that they are not normally called to then it is expected that their sense of uncertainty is increased (Pizio, 2014, p. 253). Consequently, this may also raise the level of anticipated disrespect they will have to face.

The way people choose to behave in certain situations will directly impact the outcome. The police response to these types of situations will affect the level of respect they receive from the public. Nevertheless, the reaction from the members of the public will influence the respect they get from the police and whether or not the police will have to use force. Therefore, the more respectful the public is towards the police, the more cordial the police officers will be towards the public (Pizio, 2014, p. 250). The response from the officers may be authoritative if the public challenges the police's authority or refuses to obey the police (Pizio, 2014, p. 250). The police may deem it necessary to shoot someone depending on the situation at hand. Best and Quigley (2003) state, "The characteristics of the individuals who were shot and the tactics used by the police in responding to a potential firearms incident" determine the possibility of someone being shot and killed by the police (p. 350). The police in the United States have a clear method for dealing with disrespect. In the U.S., the probability of the police to arrest a member of a public will increase when he or she is hostile, fails to obey the officer's authority, or is disrespectful (Pizio, 2014, p. 250). In the United Kingdom, it cannot be assumed that every encounter the police has with the public does not have a little dissatisfaction (Pizio, 2014, p. 251).

The public's view of law enforcement will alter the level of disrespect. Pizio (2014) notes that there is not a large amount of empirical evidence that depicts disrespect from occurring when the police are engaged in arrests and other law enforcement situations that clearly define their authority (p. 251). Most citizens in the United Kingdom have expressed their dissatisfaction with the process of the police and not the individual officer themselves (Pizio, 2014, p. 251). This encourages the public to proactively and

respectfully respond to unwanted treatment from the police. Instead of the members of the public being disrespectful when encountering the police, they are more probable to file a formal complaint to the police department (Pizio, 2014, p. 251). This type of action will help to prevent an escalated situation from occurring. There is a sense of “civil nature of interpersonal relations” in the United Kingdom is a driving force behind the public to formally file complaints. Therefore, when the public behaves more civilly than disrespectfully, the police will not need to carry weapons in their daily routine patrols. However, when citizens are disrespectful, then the chances of the police using force are increased.

VII. FIREARMS

Firearms are a current topic of discussion in the Met and the public. Debates on whether or not to allow the police officers to carry firearms are occurring in parliament, the Met, and the public. This issue is not just an English matter, it also extends into Scotland and Wales. First, a history synopsis is necessary in order to understand the issue at hand. Kelly (2012) cites, in 2010-2011, England and Wales had 388 firearm offenses which included serious or even fatal injuries. This figure, however, is 13 percent lower than the 2009-2010 figures (Kelly, 2012). Also in England and Wales, “Firearms were used in a total of 9,974 recorded crimes” (Best & Quigley, 2003, p. 349). The total number of injuries that occurred in Scotland may be used to gauge the amount in England. Scotland had both 109 non-fatal injuries and two fatal firearm incidents in the 2010-2011 period. This is a decade-long low (Kelly, 2012). This proves that encounters with firearms do occur in Britain. However, Kelly (2012) states that gun crime, overall, remains low. Keating (2011) says, from 1900 to 2006, sixty-seven British police officers

have been killed by firearms. Northern Ireland is not included in this statistic (Keating 2011). In more recent times, during the period of 1991 and 2002, only three officers have been “fatally injured” and forty-six police officers have been “seriously injured” (Best & Quigley, 2003, p. 349). The killing of police officers is not a recent threat and a few incidents have sparked many concerns in the public and the police. Kelly (2014) says, the murder of Police Constable Sharon Beshenivsky who was shot and killed during a robbery in 2005 and three plain clothes police officers, were murdered in 1966. These two incidents helped facilitate movements for the Met to be armed.

Due to these events, including officers and members of the public being killed, there is a campaign for the Met to carry firearms in the course of its duties. This campaign is against the Met’s original intended policy of being firearm free. As stated, Sir Robert Peel created the Met with the intent for them not to carry firearms (Kelly 2012). When he formed the Met there was a strong fear of the military amongst the public. The public thought that this new police force would become oppressive (Kelly 2012). Sir Robert Peel incorporated many policies that would disallow this force to become oppressive, thus settling the public’s unrest. This new force would not carry firearms and would wear blue uniforms in lieu of red ones (Kelly 2012). The blue uniforms would help because the red was associated with infantry. These two major changes would allow the Met to be distinguished from the Army (Kelly 2012).

Nevertheless, the Met has carried firearms in its history. In 1884, the police were issued revolvers in response to the murder of two officers. It was not mandatory for the officers to carry the firearms but, they were able to choose whether or not they wanted to carry them. In 1936, the weapons were formally retired for everyone on the force

(Keating 2011). From this date, according to Kelly (2014), “Only trained officers at the rank of sergeant or above were issued with guns, and even then only if they could show a good reason [for having one].” There was one exception when the Met was issued firearms, which was during World War II, in case of a German Invasion. Nevertheless, these particular firearms were not to be used during patrol (Keating, 2011). However, Best and Quigley (2003) clearly state, “The police forces in England and Wales can be regarded as predominantly unarmed” (p. 349). Although firearms were implemented in the Met several times, they were never required to be carried and now only supervisors may carry them with specific reasons.

The Met struggles with the balance of safety to the public, as well as its officers, and the history of the force including the policies that were created by Sir Robert Peel which advocates against the use of firearms. The force authorized about seventeen percent of the officers to carry firearms in the 1950s and 1960s. These authorizations were in response to a number of shootings of police officers during these decades. After the police engaged in several shootings, these authorizations were revoked in the 1980s. Notwithstanding, the threats that are posed to the officers still exist despite the fact the police do not regularly carry firearms. Therefore, specially trained officers are now certified to use tasers instead of firearms (Keating, 2011). Met Commissioner Bernard Hogan-Howe “called for police response officers to be routinely armed with Tasers,” in November of 2011 (Kelly, 2014). Tasers provide a useful tool for the police instead of firearms.

Taser, more properly TASER, is an acronym for Thomas A. Swift Electrical Rifle (DeLone & Thompson, 2009, p. 416). The patent for the Taser was adopted in 1974

(DeLone & Thompson, 2009, p. 416). The use of the device by many departments in the United States is growing. DeLone and Thompson (2009) state, “Approximately 7,000 of the nation’s [United States] 18,000 law enforcement agencies have implemented the use of TASERS” (p. 416). Tasers work by delivering electrical volts through the body. At a rate of nineteen pulses per second, they can produce an electrical charge of 50,000 volts (DeLone & Thompson, 2009, p. 417). The normal charge that is administered is approximately 1,200 volts (DeLone & Thompson, 2009, p. 417). These volts are delivered via two metal barbs that attach to the suspect (DeLone & Thompson, 2009, p. 417). These barbs can be deployed up to thirty-five feet away from a suspect and the volts may be repeatedly administered providing that the barbs remain attached to the suspect (DeLone & Thompson, 2009, p. 417). Tasers are generally considered less-than-lethal weapons (DeLone & Thompson, 2009, p. 416). However, they can still provide lethal injuries to the suspect even though these injuries were never intended by the administering officers (DeLone & Thompson, 2009, p. 416).

Tasers may provide the police with a great alternative to implementing a universal policy on carrying firearms. The routine patrol officers in the Met may result to Tasers instead of firearms. DeLone and Thompson (2009) do state that more research is necessary to determine the effectiveness of Tasers (p. 428). Therefore, at this time, a universal conclusion cannot be determined on whether or not to implement Tasers as an alternative to firearms. However, it does appear that they provide a good alternative to firearms since they are considered less-than-lethal weapons. Consequently, they may not pose the same concerns with the public that firearms currently pose.

The police have engaged in shootings today which raises concerns from the public

about its authority. There were twenty-four situations, between 1998 and 2001, when the police discharged their weapons which resulted in fatalities or injuries to members of the public (Best & Quigley, 2003, p. 350). Regardless of the small number of incidents, “Public concerns exist about the arming of the police” (Best & Quigley, 2003, p. 350). Consequently, the Police Complaints Authority was reviewed all twenty-four police shootings (Best & Quigley, 2003, p. 350).

In the present day, more officers are starting to become authorized to carry firearms. However, this figure still remains low. It is recognized that the British police is not firearm free. According to the latest Home Office figures, there are 6,653 officers who are “authorized to use firearms in England and Wales” (Kelly, 2012). This is approximately five percent of the total number of police officers (Kelly, 2012). The trend is also observed in Scotland; police officers in Scotland are also authorized to carry firearms. Only 274 Scottish police officers out of 17,318 routinely carry firearms while on duty. This is about 1.6 percent of the total number of officers (Kelly, 2014). Additionally, Kelly (2014) states, “A much smaller number [of officers] will be on duty at any one time” since they work shifts. Therefore, there is an even smaller number of firearms that may be deployed at any one given time.

The figures for the Met alone are similar. Since 2009, there were approximately 2,700 out of about 33,000 police officers who were authorized to carry firearms. This is dissimilar to American police officers due to the fact that these London officers are not “armed on a regular basis” (Keating, 2011). These numbers include the police firearms units. The Met has specialized firearms units and police armed response vehicles. These armed response vehicles have been used since 1991 (Kelly, 2012). Keating (2011) cite,

these vehicles are “specially modified police cars” that can respond to crimes with guns or “provide backup on dangerous assignments.” For example, these special assignment may include drug raids (Keating, 2011). The specialized firearms units have been deployed since 1966. Currently, they are referred to as CO19. They provide tactical support as well as firearms training to the other police officers in the Met.

These specialized firearms units have not been fully supported by the public. In 2005, these units were greatly criticized due to them shooting an unarmed Brazilian man, Jean Charles de Menezes. In the aftermath of the London Underground terrorist attacks, he was mistaken as a suicide bomber. Consequently, no charges were filed against the officers, but the Met did have to pay a fine (Keating, 2011). Situations similar to this decrease the public confidence and trust in the Met resulting in public unrest.

VIII. ANALYZING POLICE SHOOTINGS

The police officers in the Met have engaged in shootings throughout its history. Since the creation of the Armed Response Vehicles (ARVs), the shootings can be analyzed more thoroughly using the timing of events for multiple incidents. In a study conducted by Best and Quigley in 2003, they looked at data from twenty different incidents involving police shootings. These twenty cases originated from the twenty-four cases that took place between 1998 and 2001 (Best & Quigley, 2003, p. 350). Four cases were deducted from the original twenty-four because “they were pre-planned police firearms operations” (Best & Quigley, 2003, p. 350). This study was intended to look at response times of the police in reference to the discharge of the police firearms during “spontaneous incidents” (Best & Quigley, 2003, p. 350). Best and Quigley analyzed five different time periods throughout the occurrence of each incident. First, the time the

police were first made aware of the incident. Second, the documented time of arrival of the unarmed police at the scene. Third, the ARV was requested. Fourth, the time the ARV arrived on the scene. Fifth, the time police weapon was discharged (Best & Quigley, 2003, p. 353). The table below (Figure 1) shows the timing, in minutes before the discharge of the weapon (Best & Quigley, 2003, p. 353):

Case	Public Made Aware	Unarmed Police on Scene	ARV Requested	Armed Police on Scene
1	112	109	105	99
2	41	17	16	3
3	54	39	42	22
4	40	40	8	-
5	219	-	211	135
6	63	60	59	32
7 (B)	90	68	81	68
8	10	-	8	0
9 (C)	25	15	-	1
10	186	165	159	120
11	25	19	23	14
12	11	3	11	3
13	72	65	72	48
14	16	14	16	1
15 (A)	592	-	-	288
16	199	5	3	4
17	39	-	-	-
18	18	-	14	1
19	46	-	27	15
20	567	-	554	-

Figure 1, (Best & Quigley, 2003, p. 353).

The statistics in this data will help analyze the shootings by the police. The mean of the variation between the time of initial police awareness to the discharge of a weapon is 121.2 minutes. The standard deviation is 168.9 minutes (Best & Quigley, 2003, p. 353). Eleven cases out of the twenty had less than sixty minutes from the initial police awareness to the discharge of a weapon. This figure is represented as N=11. The arrival time of unarmed officers to the scene was only available for thirteen cases. This is represented as N=13. The mean time is 47.6 minutes before the discharge of a weapon (Best & Quigley, 2003, p. 354).

The N=13 number may be separated into two different categories. First, there were seven incidents when the unarmed police were on the scene prior to the ARV being requested. This figure is represented by N=7. Second, there were six situations when the request for the ARV was made prior to the unarmed officers arriving on the scene. This is represented as N=6. Best and Quigley (2003) clarified that the N=6 cases occurred when a member of the public reported to the police that an individual was in possession of a firearm. Consequently, the ARV was requested without delay (p. 354). In regard to the N=7 total, the responding police officers became aware of an armed threat and requested the ARV after their arrival to the scene (Best & Quigley, 2003, p. 354).

The ARV response time will impact the situation at hand. According to this data set, from the request of the ARV to the actual discharge of a firearm the mean time is 82.9 minutes. However, this data is slightly skewed by one incident, case number twenty. Therefore, it should be recognized that there are eleven different cases where the ARV request to the discharge of a firearm was less than sixty minutes (Best & Quigley, 2003, p. 354).

Most importantly, the amount of time the ARV arrived on the scene before the discharge of a police firearm occurred. The mean time is 62.0 minutes for seventeen of the recorded cases. However, there are a few instances where the officers were unable to contain the suspect prior to the arrival of the ARV or had to actually locate the suspect (Best & Quigley, 2003, p. 354). In nine of the incidents, the ARVs were on the scene for fifteen minutes or less before the discharge of a police firearm (Best & Quigley, 2003, p. 354). There were a few other incidents that are documented in this study where the police officers discharged their firearms “almost immediately upon arrival at the scene” (Best & Quigley, 2003, p. 354-355). This is due to the fact that the perceived an immediate threat from the individual (Best & Quigley, 2003, p. 355).

This study clearly depicts the response times of both the unarmed officers from the time the initial incident was made aware to the police as well as the time the ARVs arrived on the scene after being requested. One of the most important figures in this data set is the time between the time the ARVs arrived on the scene and the time the police discharged their firearms. It is noted in this study whether or not the incident was prolonged by the officers being required to locate the suspect upon their arrival. In nine of the cases, the officers were able to shoot the suspect within fifteen minutes of their arrival. According to Figure 1, the next highest time between the discharge of the firearms and the arrival of the ARVs was twenty-two minutes. Also, There are six cases where the police discharged their firearms within three minutes of the arrival of the ARVs and five instances where it took more than 60 minutes after the arrival of the ARVs for the police to discharge their firearms. Further, three of the cases were unable to provide such evidence.

Analyzing the time the ARVs were requested provides important information to the types of situations. In six cases, the ARVs were requested prior to the unarmed officers arriving on the scene. There are five cases where the ARVs were requested less than two minutes after the police being made aware of the situation and seven cases where the ARV's were requested less than five minutes after the police being made aware of the situation.

This study also addresses the fact that the conduct of the members of the public influences the police's response to the situation (Best & Quigley, 2003, p. 350). As stated above, a major contributing factor of officers' method of response is the level of citizen disrespect. The police acknowledge that they have to face disrespectful citizens each day (Pizio, 2014, p. 251). Therefore, when the members of the public are disrespectful towards the police, then the probability of them being shot is increased. Additionally, during the nine times the ARVs were requested, they discharged their firearms within fifteen minutes of arrival. Therefore, when an ARV unit is requested, it is probable that they will discharge their weapon rather quickly after their arrival. They will do so only if it is necessary for them to discharge their weapons.

XI. IMPLEMENTING MORE FIREARMS IN THE FUTURE

Brian Paddick, the former Met deputy assistant commissioner, is cited in Kelly (2012) as stating the great responsibility of carrying firearms is reminded by the police officers every time an officer has shot someone. For this reason, he does not believe that police officers will support a "universal rollout" due to the fact that the "front-line officers would not be keen to face the agonising, split-second decisions faced by their counterparts in specialist firearms units" (Kelly, 2012). This heavy responsibility that

firearms present to the force decreases the amount of support that the officers have for carrying them.

Police officers do not greatly support the carrying of firearms. Chief constables, officers, and politicians are concerned about losing the equilibrium that has existed and has been maintained throughout Britain's 183 year old policing history (Kelly, 2012). Furthermore, Paddick has stated that the police want to continue to remain approachable in order to utilize the public as "the eyes and ears of the police" (Kelly, 2012). The Met recognizes this as a valuable resource and the officers do not want to lose it (Kelly, 2012). When police officers are asked, they overwhelmingly respond that they want to "remain unarmed" (Kelly, 2012). Therefore, studies have shown that over eighty percent of police officers in Britain have said that they do not want all officers armed despite the fact that levels of violent crime are increasing (Keating, 2011). A survey of 47,328 Police Federation members, conducted in 2006, found that 82 percent do not want police officers to routinely carry firearms while on duty while, half of the respondents indicated that, in the past three years, their lives had been "in serious jeopardy" (Kelly, 2014). The police officers, although a representative sample, have expressed that they do not want to be armed while on duty.

The public has its own view on the police carrying firearms. The members of the public have been aware of the police carrying firearms while on duty at certain locations and during certain events. In London, officers at the embassies, airports, and other security-sensitive locations has become a familiar site to the public (Kelly, 2014). The September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks in America have triggered this increase in the deployment of firearms to officers in these specific locations (Kelly, 2012). Thus,

according to Kelly (2012), firearms are an increasingly accepted part of life in Britain.

Firearms are also used at specific events in Britain. In Scotland, John Finnie is an independent Member of the Scottish Parliament (MSP) and a former police officer. A constituent approached him and said that he “felt less safe” because he saw an armed police officer at the finishing line of the Highland Cross biathlon. This man also expressed his concern regarding these armed officers citing that he felt, “A major incident was underway” (Kelly, 2014). Although the police carry firearms at major events to quickly respond to major situations, they actually cause some members of the public to be concerned about a possible threat.

The public has its own view on whether or not the Met should carry firearms on a regular basis or not. According to an ICM poll that was conducted in April of 2004, 47 percent of respondents supported arming all of the police. In this study, 48 percent of respondents were against arming all of the police (Kelly, 2012). The results of this particular study depict the public as being split on this issue. In 2007, the Policy Exchange, a center-right think-tank, found that 72 percent of 2,156 of adult respondents wanted more armed police units (Kelly, 2014). That is a large percentage for a representative sample.

Additionally in Scotland, specifically the Highlands, sixteen police officers are authorized to carry firearms on a routine basis. However, strong hostility is still present with elected representatives because they are fearful that this change in tactics will promote armed criminals (Kelly, 2014). For example, Kenny MacAskill, the Scottish Justice Minister, had addressed the MSPs after an outcry. He expressed that the public “understands and accepts” the requirement for a few officers to carry firearms. Further,

they understand that Sir Stephen House, the chief constable of Police Scotland, to control their deployment (Kelly, 2014).

A major concern for the police to carry firearms is the historical principle of the Met. The Met was created with its primary duty to serve the public. Its primary duty was not intended to serve the state (Kelly, 2014). Consequently, arming the Met may transform its primary responsibility from the people to the state. Opponents of arming the police force argue that an armed police force would “undermine the principle of policing by consent” (Kelly, 2012). It is recognized that police forces around the world are armed and, thus, owe their primary duty to the state (Kelly, 2012). Kelly (2014) states, the police forces in the United States, Australia, Canada, and all major forces in Europe are armed. In contrast, the police forces in the Irish Republic, New Zealand, and Britain do not carry firearms (Kelly, 2014). As a result, they do not owe their primary duty to the state, but rather the public. In the past, the only forces in the UK that carried firearms on a regular basis were the Civil Nuclear Constabulary, forces in Northern Ireland, and the Ministry of Defense Police (Kelly, 2014). Presently, Met police units are now being armed with firearms on a routine basis.

X. CONCLUSION

The Met is designed to serve the public without relying on the use of force. They have successfully implemented different strategies in policing since its founding in the 1800s by Sir Robert Peel. He carefully created the police force that would keep the entirety of England under control. When he did so, he paid attention to the public’s concern about a militia that would serve the state (Kelly 2012). Instead, he formed the London Metropolitan Police Department with the goal to serve the public using

developed tactics instead of the use of firearms.

The reason the regular patrol units in the Met do not carry firearms is due to the fact that they use community policing as the primary strategy in policing. Within the concept of community policing, the Met has appropriately balanced the combination of service and force when on patrol. It responds to calls of crime, but the majority of the officers' time is spent on calls of service and interacting with the community (Pizio, 2014, p. 249).

Through the practice of community policing, the Met has been able to utilize intelligence-led policing during the course of its duties. ILP is a practical strategy to fighting crime by taking a proactive approach. The relationships the police rely upon with the community is necessary in order to effectively implement ILP (James, 2014, p. 75). The members of the public can provide valuable information to the police regarding the specifics of crimes and future crimes that may occur (James, 2014, p. 75).

Police officers understand that they will feel disrespected by the public during certain situations (Pizio, 2014, p. 253). This perceived disrespect triggers various means of use of force by the officers (Pizio, 2014, p. 250). However, they generally use this force against the citizens when it is warranted. Cited in Best & Quigley (2003), the behavior of the public influences the type of response by the police (p. 350). The methods in which the police handle these situations is relevant to understanding the reasons the Met do not need to carry firearms on a regular basis. Since the public generally respects the police department, the Met may not need to need to carry firearms on a daily basis. Additionally, the public feels threatened by a possible catastrophe when weapons are deployed during a major event (Kelly, 2014). Therefore, Met must be careful to not create more panic when trying to be proactive about a quick response to a situation.

This paper analyzed a study conducted in 2003 by Best and Quigley. They reviewed twenty out of twenty-four police shootings that occurred between 1998 and 2001 (Best & Quigley, 2003, p. 350). The data in this study depict the five specific times that were documented for each incident. The time the police were aware of the situation, the time the unarmed police arrived on the scene, the time the ARVs were requested, the time the ARVs arrived on the scene, and the time the police discharged their firearms (Best & Quigley, 2003, p. 353).

The police in the Met have expressed that they do not generally support a policy to universally implement a firearms policy for fulfilling its daily routine (Kelly, 2012). They want to continue to remain approachable by the public to continue the unique relationship the police department has with the members of the public (Kelly, 2012). They view this relationship to be a great asset in its strategy of policing which is a combination of service and force. This, translated into ILP and community policing, has been the backbone of the Met since 1829. The Met was created in response to public fear of a state controlled militia (Kelly 2012). Evidently, part of that fear still remains in existence from members of the public. Notwithstanding, the police hold the same stance, but with a different fear. They have the fear of losing an important resource, the public. Therefore, it is imperative for the London Metropolitan Police Department to continue to protect the public by using its public confidence, established through community oriented policing and ILP. Thus, the Met does not need to carry firearms to execute its routine duties on a daily basis.

References

- Best, D. & Quigley, A. (2003). Shootings by the police: What predicts when a firearms officer in England and Wales will pull the trigger? *Policing and Society*, 13(4), 349-364.
- Bullock, K. (2013). Community, intelligence-led policing and crime control. *Policing & Society*, 23(2), 125-144. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10439463.2012.671822>
- DeLone, G. J. & Thompson, L. M. (2009). The application and use of TASERS by a Midwestern police agency. *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, 11(4), 414-428. DOI: 10.1350/ijps.2009.11.4.139
- James, A. (2014). Forward to the past: Reinventing intelligence-led policing in Britain. *Police Practice and Research*, 15(1), 75-88.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15614263.2012.754126>
- Keating, J. E. (2011, August 10). When are British cops allowed to carry guns? foreignpolicy.com. Retrieved from <http://foreignpolicy.com/2011/08/10/when-are-british-cops-allowed-to-carry-guns/>
- Kelly, J. (2014, August 6). The British police on armed routine patrol. *BBC News Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://www.bbc.com/news/magazine-28656324>
- Kelly, J. (2012, September 19). Why British police don't have guns. *BBC News Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://www.bbc.com/news/magazine-19641398>
- Mayer, C., Crumbly, B., Israely, J., & Ripley, A. (2008, August 18). A case for the Yard. *The International (Atlantic Edition)*, 172(7), 34-36. Retrieved from <http://p2048-ezproxy.uakron.edu.lib.ezproxy.uakron.edu:2048/login?url=http://search.ebscoho>

st.com/login.aspx? direct=true&db=a9h&AN=33662541&site=ehost-live

Pizio, W. (2014). London Metropolitan Police: Experiences and perceptions of citizen

disrespect. *Police Practice and Research*, 15(3), 249-260.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15614263.2013.795743>

Stanko, B., Jackson, J., Bradford, B., & Hohl, K. (2012). A golden thread, a presence

amongst uniforms, and a good deal of data: Studying public confidence in the

London Metropolitan Police. *Policing & Society*, 22(3), 317-331.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10439463.2012.671825>